

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8577

make a distinct contribution to development by helping remedy this deficiency.

I think this is one of the best ideas for contributing to the development of less-developed countries which has been devised. I am particularly pleased that the senior Senator from my own State of Indiana has been responsible for initiating this new plan, and for securing action by the U.S. Government. During a trip to Africa in 1962, Senator VANCE HARTKE discovered that the development of Africa was being held back by the lack of trained manpower. It seemed to him that this was a golden opportunity for American business, in cooperation with the U.S. Government, to render technical assistance of a kind which American businessmen are peculiarly well-qualified to give. On his return, Senator HARTKE urged the Department of State to look into the matter. This resulted in a study which was concluded in the fall of 1963. The Agency for International Development then convened a conference of leading businessmen and business organizations to discuss the project. As a result of the conference, David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Sol Linowitz, head of the Xerox Corp., assumed cochairmanship of a committee to establish the Executive Service Corps as a private, American business enterprise backed up by the U.S. Government.

Other members of the organizing committee are: Mr. C. D. Jackson, vice president, Time, Inc.; Mr. John H. Johnson, president, Johnson Publications; Mr. D. A. Kimball, chairman, Aerojet-General; Mr. William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System; and Mr. Ray Eppert, president, Burroughs Co.

The basic idea of this program is simple and straightforward. One of the greatest needs in the developing countries is clearly the kind of technical and managerial and entrepreneurial know-how which is essential to the growth of private enterprise. Most of these countries are seriously lacking in this kind of know-how. At the same time, there are in the United States many men of considerable business experience who are either retired or in a position to take some time off and who are more than willing to make their know-how available to help the United States and the free world advance along private enterprise lines.

As currently visualized the Executive Service Corps would seek to make qualified U.S. business personnel available to meet four major needs in developing countries

First. To provide consultant or actual operating services to medium-sized local private business firms in the developing countries which cannot get needed high-level manpower locally and which cannot afford to employ Americans in any normal commercial way because of the high costs in hard currencies which are normally involved. Such services might include, for example, a production man, or a marketing man, or a financial man, or even a general manager for a local manufacturing, distribution or similar enterprise.

Second. To provide similar services to

smaller local firms on a multiple basis by working as staff members of development banks, development centers, productivity centers, and other similar organizations designed to serve local private enterprise.

Third. To work with local individuals or groups of entrepreneurs who see a good opportunity to develop a new local industry or other commercial facility and have some of or all of the necessary capital, but lack the know-how to develop a full financial and technical plan for the new enterprise and to get the new operation financed and launched.

Fourth. In some cases to provide independent high-level teams which would work out of local development banks or other appropriate institutions in developing countries to make broad surveys of industrial development needs and to identify specific situations in which more specialized U.S. managerial or technical talents might usefully be applied.

The major distinguishing features of the proposed new operation as compared with existing AID technical assistance and Peace Corps programs will be that the personnel will be available to help private enterprises directly and the personnel will be available to do actual operating jobs as distinguished from purely advisory to governments. A third major difference will be that the members of the corps will come as individual volunteers not as U.S. Government representatives in any sense.

An effective Executive Service Corps can fill a major gap in the coverage of existing U.S. public and private activities in relation to the developing countries and can thereby make a highly significant contribution to the U.S. national interest in assisting these countries to develop as orderly free societies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the April 4, 1964, New York Times, "Industry Forming a Group Like the Peace Corps":

INDUSTRY FORMING A GROUP LIKE THE PEACE CORPS: PROGRAM URGED BY JOHNSON—BUSINESSMEN WILL GO TO NEEDY LANDS AS ADVISERS

(By McCandlish Phillips)

An overseas business corps modeled on the Peace Corps is being formed by industry at the suggestion of the Johnson administration.

The Executive Service Corps expects to be in operation by late summer. Its central office will probably be in New York.

The corps would draw mostly on newly retired executives who are not ready to be put out to hammock. They would go overseas on special tasks for periods ranging from 3 months to 2 years, or longer.

Volunteers would be assigned to semideveloped countries to assist in the expansion of industries owned there. That would include most of South America and the industrial awakening regions of Africa and Asia.

The program will not include European or other fully developed economies, nor would it take in primitive areas.

An organizing committee has been named, headed by David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Sol Linowitz, chairman of the Xerox Corp.

The purpose of the Executive Service Corps will be to serve the broad national objective of accelerating the development of other

countries along private enterprise lines, which the administration believes will be the quickest, and best for them as well as for the United States.

At the same time, it will provide a challenging outlet for useful service to men who have been put on the retirement lists of American industry. Many men are being retired at the age of 62 or even 60, although they consider themselves at the height of their power.

Mr. Linowitz said that management and technical men would be made available to overseas industries as advisers, supervisors or on-the-job managers, according to local need.

Pay will not be on the scale to which retired businessmen had been accustomed, but most volunteers will presumably have savings and pension incomes.

They would be paid an adequate cost-of-living wage by the concerns for which they worked, in addition to travel and insurance cost. The corps might provide a small additional stipend.

The corps would be a private, nongovernmental corporation. To get it off the ground, the Government stands ready to provide initial funds until, hopefully, the business community underwrites the whole enterprise.

In his foreign-aid message to Congress on March 19, President Johnson declared: "We must do more to utilize private initiative in the United States—and in the developing countries—to promote economic development abroad."

He said then that the Administration was "encouraging the establishment of an Executive Service Corps."

The primary responsibility for getting the organization going has rested with the Agency for International Development (AID), the semiautonomous unit headed by David E. Bell that runs the foreign-aid program within the State Department.

The agency put the organizing committee together. Besides Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Linowitz, its members are: C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc.; William S. Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Daniel A. Kimball, president of Aerojet-General and former Secretary of the Navy; John H. Johnson, president of the Johnson Publishing Co. of Chicago, and Ray Eppert, president of the Burroughs Corp.

An official of the development agency said: "We did the groundwork, and when we asked the private community to take over, they very quickly did and we're now standing in the wings, ready with a little money when they ask for it."

TO SEND 1,000 ABROAD

No budget has been drawn. The aim is to get about 1,000 men overseas in the first 30 months, probably at a cost of several million dollars, of which the Government will provide the greater part.

The Development Agency has assigned Thomas O. Thomas, a 37-year-old member of the corps' planning staff, to New York to act as liaison between the Government and the organizing committee.

Mr. Thomas said the idea for the corps "has so many parents it is hard to pin its origins down," but he, and others in the project, credited Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat of Indiana, with having urged the initial study that showed the concept to be potentially workable.

THE RAYBURN OFFICE BUILDING FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

8578

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 23

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the act originating the Rayburn Office Building for the Members of the House of Representatives was approved April 22, 1955. I was not a Member of Congress in 1955 and I was not a Member of Congress in 1956. Public Law 24, 84th Congress, H.R. 4903, approved April 22, 1955—69 statute 41-42. Additional House Office Building Act of 1955, \$5 million appropriated. Passed House, March 18, 1955, no rollcall vote. Public Law 624, 84th Congress, H.R. 11473, approved June 27, 1956—70 statute 368. Legislative Appropriation Act, 1957, \$10 million appropriated. Passed House, May 29, 1956, no rollcall vote. I am for economy in and out of Government. I have never tried to justify waste and extravagance. We have five children.

FOREIGN AID

On Wednesday March 25, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. He emphasized that in his opinion there currently is being given by the Congress not enough military assistance in the foreign aid program. I quote a portion of his statement:

As the Joint Chiefs have just completed our exhaustive annual review of requirements, the shortcomings of the current \$1 billion MAP program are fresh in my mind. A continuation of military aid at this level indefinitely will offer us but three options: A gradual reduction of indigenous military capability in strategically important areas of the free world; a buildup of U.S. forces at a far greater cost to compensate for the loss in indigenous strength; or, the acceptance of inadequate military strength to support our national interests in some quarters of the world. I can assure you that there are no reserves in the pipeline or elsewhere which can make any substantial contribution to relieving the requirement for the appropriation of substantial new funds by the Congress. I would say that the experience of the current year has demonstrated the inadequacy of the reduced level.

Such comments as these convince me that the fiscal year 1964 program has been inadequate to permit the development of friendly forces which are required in our own national interest. With this experience in mind, the 1965 program of \$1 billion can only be regarded as a folding operation of borderline adequacy.

In closing, I wish to state that from my viewpoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the sharply reduced fiscal year 1964 MAP program was a significant exception to the strong support the Congress has ordinarily given to our national defense programs. In my opinion, a further reduction of the fiscal year 1965 program below \$1 billion would be a tragic emasculation of a program vital to our national security interests. The fiscal year 1965 program before you has the strongest support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and on their behalf, I urge the authorization and appropriation of the full program submission.

I wish to say I have confidence in Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor and I have tried to help him and our Secretary of Defense get the amount of military assistance which they have felt is the minimum for the security of our country.

I quote the pertinent portion of a let-

ter which was written to me January 22, 1964, by Col. Clyde M. Dillender, Jr., of the Department of Defense:

All in all, the foreign assistance programs of the United States are important to our national security and should be continued.

To replace this vital asset for collective security with comparable and similarly deployed American troops would involve a totally unacceptable drain on our manpower and monetary resources. It would send the defense budget soaring and add to the taxpayer's burden an amount many times the cost of military assistance which makes possible the accomplishment of our own forward strategy with minimum expenditure in men and money. Even more significantly, it would require the drafting of many more young men, interrupting their education, disrupting family life and depriving the economy of the fresh manpower essential to vigorous growth.

On April 8, 1963, Hon. Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. I enclose a portion of the record of the hearing.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Now, with reference to that foreign aid which is not known as military aid, how would you compare it along this line or what statement would you make about it?

Secretary McNAMARA. Mr. BECKWORTH, I can make the statement I did with respect to other portions of the defense budget because I have reviewed every dollar of the \$53½ billion budget in great detail.

I have not reviewed every dollar of the total foreign aid program in equal detail and therefore I cannot properly assess for you the relative importance of a dollar of military assistance versus a dollar of economic assistance. They are both required in my mind.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Would you say the economic aid that you know about is less important, equally as important, or more important than that military assistance that you are talking about?

Secretary McNAMARA. I would make the same statement with respect to the economic aid that I did with respect to military assistance. I believe we are providing economic aid in such a way that it directly relates to our national security. I don't believe that we as a nation with a gross national product of over \$550 billion need concern ourselves with our ability to finance actions that we think are directly related to our national security.

I realize that this is not directly responsive to your question, but I am not in a position to respond by comparing a dollar of economic aid with a dollar of military aid.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 20, 1964.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the President, may I acknowledge your letter of April 18 expressing your support of efforts to obtain a full workload for the Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory at Dairfield.

We are encouraged by the favorable response from NASA, and you may be assured of our interest in exploring every possibility for the continued use of this facility.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS CONDEMNED

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution, on which I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take immediate action. In the past 24 months it has become abundantly clear that the Soviet Government has singled out its Jewish citizens for persecution. The promises of egalitarianism proclaimed at the time of the October revolution and written into the Soviet constitution were first ignored by the late unlamented dictator, Joseph Stalin. His particular brand of anti-Semitism culminated in the infamous "doctors plot" shortly before his death.

While the excesses of Stalin were condemned by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Communist Party Congress in 1956, we now see that a new brand of anti-Semitism has forced its way through the Party line and expressed itself in the persecution of Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union: It takes the form of singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic crimes, of confiscating synagogues, of closing Jewish cemeteries, of arresting rabbis and curtailing religious observances, of discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and higher education and of the prohibition against the baking of matzoth during the Passover holiday—and of preventing Jews from living by the traditions of their faith.

It is clear that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have fostered and encouraged these acts. The Congress should adopt this resolution condemning religious persecution by the Soviet Union and should call upon the Soviet Government, in the name of decency and humanity, to cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and to permit the free exercise of religion by all within its borders.

RELIGION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(Mr. LESINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, just the racial aspects of the civil rights bill, now pending in the Senate, have all but obscured its religious significance.

And yet, if the bill becomes law, its effects upon an individual because of his religious affiliation may be dramatic.

Opponents of the measure contend the bill carries authority to force employers to hire according to a person's religion.

Its supporters deny this. They say the very essence of the bill is to outlaw that practice.

Which opinions, as can be plainly seen, are about as diametrically opposed as opinions can be.

What is the truth?

It is not easy to find.

Consider parts of two sections of the bill, pertinent parts which seem to bear on this facet of the argument. They are sections 701 and 704.

The first, section 701, reads:

The Congress hereby declares that the opportunity for employment without discrimi-